

J S - 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. EDCV 23-2072 JGB (SHKx)

Date February 8, 2024

Title *Sharon Kidd, et al. v. Sheriff Chad Bianco, et al.*

Present: The Honorable JESUS G. BERNAL, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

MAYNOR GALVEZ

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

None Present

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Present

**Proceedings: Order DISMISSING Plaintiff's Complaint for Failure to Prosecute
(IN CHAMBERS)**

On October 11, 2023, Plaintiff filed a complaint against defendants Chad Bianco, et al. (“Complaint,” Dkt. No. 1.) On January 26, 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause in writing by February 1, 2024, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. (“OSC,” Dkt. No. 7.) As of the date of this order, Plaintiff has neither continued to prosecute this case nor responded to the Court’s OSC.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) grants the Court authority to sua sponte dismiss actions for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with court orders. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Wolff v. California, 318 F.R.D. 627, 630 (C.D. Cal. 2016). Plaintiffs must prosecute their cases with “reasonable diligence” to avoid dismissal pursuant to Rule 41(b). Anderson v. Air W., Inc., 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Court’s OSC, and thus, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to prosecute this case with reasonable diligence and that dismissal is therefore appropriate.

Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff’s action for failure to prosecute and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to close the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.